

Applicants have cancelled all Claims and replaced them with **CLAIMS 11** through **20**,

CLAIM REJECTION- 35 U.S.C. SECTION 102

The Examiner relies solely on Zarembo alleging that Applicants' Invention is anticipated. Applicants have cited Zarembo in their Application. Applicants' Claims have been rewritten to emphasize the elements of the Invention that do not appear in Zarembo. Applicants' Invention has been designed to create and focus electromagnetic flux density in a very small space with low flux density so that it will not damage video or audio tapes, as other check-out systems do.

Applicants' Invention differs from the cited art in that Zarembo's Invention is designated with an offset core to produce a horizontal magnetic field parallel with and adjacent to the work surface, whereas the flux of the instant Invention is focused through the housing in gap of 2 inches length by the width of the transducer. **CLAIM 11** further describes a magnetic core comprised of laminated sheets of transformer steel and the separate intensifier blocks also comprised of laminated transformer steel. Zarembo does

not include any reference to a laminated core or intensifier blocks. Zarembo provides some description of his core which includes the pole pieces 40 and 42, that are molded from sintered iron powdered blocks. No mention or thought of laminated core or pieces is mentioned.

By their **CLAIMS 12, 13, 14, 15, and 16**, which are dependent upon **CLAIM 11**, Applicants further define away from Zarembo's Invention. **CLAIMS 17 through 20** also have been rewritten to incorporate inventive elements which are absent in Zarembo. Thus it is believed that none of the **CLAIMS 11 through 20** is anticipated by Zarembo.

CLAIM REJECTION- 35 U.S.C. SECTION 103

The Examiner has rejected previous **CLAIMS 4 and 5** as unpatentable over the combination of Zarembo in view of Copeland, et al..The Examiner also rejected original **CLAIMS 6 and 8** as unpatentalbe over Zarembo in view of Halperin.

Applicants have submitted amended Claims which are believed to possess patentable merit over either combination suggested by the Examiner. With regard to the Zarembo-Copeland or the Zarembo-Halperin combination, it does not follow that

Copeland or Halperin would be combined with Zarembo as each reference is complete and functional in itself, so there would be no reason to use parts from or add or substitute part to any reference. In fact, it appears that Copeland with its four (4) arms teaches away from Zarembo. Zarembo teaches a horizontal field. Whereas the coil arrangement of Copeland produces little magnetic field in the horizontal direction. The references do not contain any suggestion (express or implied) that they may be combined, or combined in the manner suggested. Even if there was some thought of combination it would not yield Applicants' Invention. The Examiner states that it would be obvious to any artisan of ordinary skill in the art to make the core of the exact type of laminated transformer steel, and intensifier blocks of a separate type of transformer steel, to attain the focused flux density that is the crux of Applicants' Invention. None of the cited Patents teach an understanding or need for such focused flux density so the artisan of ordinary skill would first have to have some goal to reach; one that is not stated by the art cited. Then the artisan would have to experiment to reach the end points Applicants reached with their Invention. But how many months or years would it take for the artisan to reach that

point? Since most Inventions are the result of experimentations, how much experimentation is considered obvious? There must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. There is not. Also there must be a reasonable expectation of success and the prior art references must teach or suggest all of the claim limitations. They cannot. certainly, too many variables exist and too much possible experimentation would be required to consider Applicants' Invention obvious.

Similarly, the Examiner suggests that it would be obvious to an artisan of obvious skill to combine the Inventions of Zarembo and Halperin to produce the same results as Applicants. The Invention of Halperin is far afield of Applicants' Invention. There is no hint as to how Zarembo and Halperin would be combined. The same arguments as previously stated apply. Applicants' Invention solves a different problem than either of the references, and such a different problem is recited in the Claims, to sensitize/desensitize security markers on video without destruction of the videos.

The references are individually complete. There is no suggestion that they should be combined with any other reference.

CONCLUSION

For all of the above reasons, Applicants submit that the Specification and Claims are now in proper form and that the Claims all define patentability over the prior art. Therefore, Applicants submit that this Application is now in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Dated: March 3, 2003

Respectfully submitted,



WILLIAM W. BURNS, ESQ.

Attorney For Applicants
Ronald L. Faria and Christine E. Reames
15720 Winchester Blvd., Suite 1A
Los Gatos, CA 95030
USPO Reg. No.: 29,901
Telephone: (408) 395-2226
Facsimile: (408) 395-6480



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

(37 CFR 1.8(a))

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner Of Patents And Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

on MARCH 5, 2003.

Name of Applicant, Assignee, or Registered Representative:

WILLIAM W. BURNS, ESQ.

REG. NO. 29,901


SIGNATURE

MARCH 5, 2003

DATE

APPLICATION NO. 09/752,236

INVENTION: SCANEZE CHECK-IN-CHECK
OUT LIBRARY WORKSTATION

INVENTORS: RONALD L. FARIA
CHRISTINE A. REAMES

LAW OFFICES OF
WILLIAM W. BURNS
15720 WINCHESTER BOULEVARD
LOS GAT S, CALIFORNIA 9503
TELEPHONE (408) 395-2226